

Remarks

In the Office Action mailed 12 May 2006, the Examiner rejected all claims (1-25) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Stuart (United States Patent Number 6,466,935).

Applicants' undersigned representative conducted extensive discussions with the Examiner seeking clarification of the Examiner's concerns and discussing possible resolutions thereof. Applicants thank the Examiner for the time and effort involved with these discussions. An Applicants' Interview Summary is submitted herewith.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, and 15 to overcome the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection. Claims 2, 3 and 13 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 12, and 15 include recitations of hierarchical naming applied to all print objects such that the hierarchical name identifies location information regarding the print object. The Examiner has expressed concern with the meaning of the hierarchical name determining location information. Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, and 15 to clarify that the hierarchical name of the print objects identify a location of the print object in the enterprise.

The Examiner has further expressed concern regarding the clarity of "print objects" as used in claims 1, 12 and 15. Applicants have amended claims 1, 12 and 15 to include that a portion of the print objects correspond to the plurality of printers, and that the print objects corresponding to the plurality of printers include a plurality of attributes for each of the plurality of printers. These recitations were previously presented in claims 2 and 3 (now cancelled). Similar features were added to independent claims 12 and 15.

The Examiner has further expressed concern with the clarity of "factors" used to schedule the print jobs. Applicants have amended claims 1, 12 and 15 to recite that one of the factors used for scheduling is the hierarchical name of the plurality of print objects, and that another factor includes the authorized users of at least one of the plurality of printers.

Conclusion

Though Applicants may pursue broader protection in a related continuing application, in hopes of advancing prosecution of this application Applicants have amended claims 1, 12 and 15 to obtain allowance and issuance of this present application. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled with their respective recitations integrated into other claims. Claim 13 includes duplicative recitations from claim 12, and has been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding objections and rejections.

Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Max Gratton, Reg. No. 56,541

Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691